

REMARKS

Claims 1-51 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 10, 13, 16, 17, 23, 25, 27, 30, 37, 41, 44, and 49 are amended. Claims 1, 4, 10, 12, 13, 16, 17, 23, 25, 27, 30, 37, 39, 41, 44, and 49 are independent.

PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

Claim 1-51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,161,134 to Wang et al. (hereinafter Wang). Although Applicant does not admit that Wang is relevant to any of claims 1-51, Applicant attaches a Rule 1.131 Declaration and Exhibit A to antedate Wang, thereby removing Wang as prior art, in an effort to expedite prosecution of the present Application.

Claims 16, 18, 27, 30, 33, 41, 44, 46, and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,266,539 to Pardo (hereinafter Pardo). This rejection, in so far as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Pardo discloses a telephone docking station that allows a personal digital assistant (PDA) to be connected to it. Pardo's telephone docking station includes telephone circuitry, which performs basic telephone functions and a modem. Pardo discloses that the connected PDA can be used to perform automatic dialing of stored phone numbers, browse the Worldwide Web, or implement features including three-way calling, call forwarding, or caller-id blocking.

Independent claims 16, 30, and 44 each recite "selecting and programming a user's personal phone features and phone policies within the PDA ..., at least one of the user's personal phone policies being used to implement at least one of the user's personal phone features in a telecommunication system."

Pardo fails to disclose any phone policies that are programmed within a PDA in order to implement phone features in a telecommunication system. In fact, Pardo's PDA provides all communication functionality, other than the basic telephony services and modem functionality of the telephone docking station. Therefore, any phone features disclosed in Pardo are not implemented in the telecommunication system (telephone network). Instead, these features remain within, and are performed by, the PDA disclosed by Pardo.

Independent claims 27, 41, and 49 disclose "displaying phone configurations in a telecommunication system." In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner does not point out any specific teaching in Pardo of displaying phone configurations. Furthermore, any phone features displayed in Pardo's PDA are implemented in the PDA itself, not the telephone system. Pardo's telephone docking station only provides the PDA with a connection to the Internet. See, e.g., Pardo at column 6, lines 6-10 and 42-49. Thus Pardo discloses nothing with respect to displaying the phone configurations in the telephone network, or any other telecommunication system. As required by independent claims 27, 41, and 49.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 16, 27, 30, 41, 44, and 49 are allowable over Pardo. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 18, 33, and 46 are allowable over Pardo by virtue of their dependency on the above-mentioned independent claims.

Should the Examiner not find Applicant's arguments persuasive as to claims 27, 41, and 49, the Examiner is respectfully requested to clearly designate the portion of Pardo that teaches the features discussed above.

Claims 1-51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,009,469 to Mattaway et al. (hereinafter

Mattaway). This rejection, in so far as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites downloading at least one phone feature and at least one phone policy arranged in a PDA to an IP phone device. Mattaway fails to disclose this feature.

Mattaway discloses a processing unit 12 that connects to the Internet and executes an IP phone application in order to communicate with other processing units 22. Mattaway suggests that the processing unit can be a PDA.

The IP phone application, which the Examiner apparently interprets as an IP phone device is executed within the processor of Mattaway's processing unit. Mattaway's PDA and IP phone device are not separate devices. Thus, Mattaway fails to disclose that the PDA downloads information including any features or policies to the IP phone device as required by independent claim 1.

Independent claims 4, 17, and 39 recite that the PDA includes pre-stored identification data for the user whose phone features and phone policies are arranged, or programmed, in the PDA. The Examiner cites portions of Mattaway, which disclose a directory including names and phone numbers of other parties whom the user of the PDA may call. Since these other parties are not users of the PDA, the Examiner has failed to point a teaching in Mattaway of the PDA storing identification data of a user who has programmed his features or policies within the PDA, as required by claims 4, 17, and 39.

Independent claims 10 and 12 disclose transferring arranged information within a PDA to an Internet Protocol-Public Branch Exchange (IP-PBX). Mattaway fails to disclose an IP-PBX, and therefore fails to disclose the above feature.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Mattaway teaches connecting the PDA to an IP-PBX (section 4.9 of page 9). To support this assertion the Examiner cites portions of Mattaway that teach the IP

phone application being operable to connect the processing unit to the Internet. There is nothing in these cited portions, nor in any other portion of Mattaway, which disclose or suggest that the processing unit communicates or transfers information to an IP-PBX, as required by independent claims 10 and 12.

Independent claims 16, 23, 25, 30, 37, and 44 each recite programming phone features and phone policies within a PDA, where one of the phone policies is used to implement at least one of the phone features in a telecommunications system. All phone features disclosed by Mattaway are programmed into, and controlled by, the IP phone application that is executed in the processing device. Thus, Mattaway discloses phone features that are implemented in the processing device, rather than in any telecommunication system (e.g., telephone network). Accordingly, Mattaway fails to disclose programming any phone policy in a PDA that implements phone features in a telecommunication system, as required by independent claims 16, 23, 25, 30, 37, and 44.

Independent claims 13, 27, 41, and 49 recite displaying phone configurations in a telecommunications system based on the phone features or phone policies of users. The Examiner fails to point out any particular portion of Mattaway disclosing the display of phone configurations. Also, since Mattaway's disclosed features are implemented in the PDA instead of any telecommunications system, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Mattaway of displaying phone configurations in a telecommunications system based on either phone features or policies of a user. Thus, Mattaway fails to disclose the displaying step required by independent claims 13, 27, 41, and 49.

For the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 4, 10, 12, 13, 16, 17, 23, 25, 27, 30, 37, 39, 41, 44, and 49 are allowable over Mattaway. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 2, 3, 5-9, 11, 14, 15, 18-21, 24, 26, 28, 29, 31-36, 38, 40, 42, 43, 45-48, 50, and 51 are allowable over Mattaway at least by virtue

of their dependency on the aforementioned independent claims. Further, should the Examiner not be persuaded by Applicant's arguments, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to clearly specify the portions of Mattaway teaching every claimed feature, particularly, the displaying of phone configurations in a telecommunications system recited in independent claims 13, 27, 41, and 49.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the various rejections and allowance of pending claims 1-51 is respectfully requested.

In the event that the Examiner is not persuaded by Applicant's arguments, or any other outstanding matters remained in the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 668-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area, to discuss this application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C.

By: _____

Gary D. Yacura
Registration No. 35,416

GDY/JWR/dg

P. O. Box 8910
Reston, VA 20195

Attachment: Rule 1.131 Declaration